



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Hideyuki KURITA et al.

Group Art Unit: 3729

Application No.: 10/735,679

Examiner: R. CHANG

Filed: December 16, 2003

Docket No.: 104961.01

For: METHOD FOR MANUFACTURING DOUBLE-SIDED FLEXIBLE PRINTED BOARD

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A Notice of Appeal is filed herewith. Applicant respectfully request review of the Final Rejection mailed March 2, 2006 in the above-identified application.

This review is requested because the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) final rejection of independent claims 1, 3 and 5 over U.S. Patent No. 5,570,506 to Tawata et al. (hereinafter "Tawata") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,336,100 to Passlick is clearly in error for at least the following reasons.

I. Applied Art Does Not Teach Forming A Circuit Layer On A Polyimide Precursor Layer

The applied art does not, either alone or in permissible combination, teach "forming a circuit layer on a polyimide precursor layer," as recited in claims 1, 3 and 5.

The Office Action asserts that col. 11, lines 20-52 of Tawata discloses "forming a second metal layer on the polyimide precursor layer." This is not correct. Rather, the first

mention of a polyimide precursor layer being applied is after a wiring layer 5 has been formed. See col. 11, lines 27-31, stating that "after forming a first wiring layer 5...[the] polyimide precursor...was spin coated thereon and the coat was cured...to form [a]...polyimide film 2." No further wiring layers are formed until after the precursor has been imidated. Thus, at most, Tawata discloses forming a circuit on an already-imidated layer, which is no longer a polyimide precursor layer. Passlick does not remedy this deficiency in Tawata.

II. Applied Art Does Not Teach Imidating, A Partially Exposed Polyimide Precursor Layer

The applied art does not teach, either alone or in permissible combination, imidating a partially exposed polyimide precursor layer, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action fails to explain why the applied prior art is believed to disclose imidation of a partially exposed polyimide precursor layer. It is clear that Tawata only discloses imidating fully exposed layers (i.e., the top layer at the time of imidating), or layers that are not exposed at all (e.g., the bottom two of the three layers mentioned at col. 11, lines 50-51). Passlick also does not disclose imidating a partially exposed polyimide precursor layer.

III. Applied Art Does Not Teach Imidating A Polyimide Precursor Layer While The Layer Includes A Circuit

The applied art does not teach, either alone or in permissible combination, imidating a polyimide precursor layer, while the polyimide precursor layer includes a circuit layer that has been formed on the polyimide precursor layer, as recited in claim 3.

The Office Action fails to explain why the applied prior art is believed to disclose imidating a polyimide precursor layer, while the polyimide precursor layer includes a circuit layer that has been formed on the polyimide precursor layer. It is clear that Tawata imidates a layer before a circuit is formed on the layer, and thus does not disclose imidating a layer

"while...the...layer includes a circuit layer that has been formed on the...layer," as recited in claim 3. Passlick again fails to remedy this deficiency.

IV. Applied Art Does Not Teach Imidating The Polyimide Precursor Layer After Forming A Circuit

The applied art does not teach, either alone or in permissible combination, after step (B) (a step of forming a circuit layer on a polyimide precursor layer), imidating the polyimide precursor layer, as recited in claim 5.

The Office Action fails to explain why the applied prior art is believed to disclose after step (B) (a step of forming a circuit layer on a polyimide precursor layer), imidating the polyimide precursor layer. It is clear that Tawata imidates the layer before the circuit layer is formed on it, not after. Passlick fails to remedy this deficiency.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that all of the pending claims are patentable over the applied art, and request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application.

Should the review panel believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, it is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:PWO/mdw

Date: June 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
